

Tikhonov regularization of control-constrained optimal control problems

Nikolaus von Daniels *

April 19, 2017

Abstract: We consider Tikhonov regularization of control-constrained optimal control problems. We present new a-priori estimates for the regularization error assuming measure and source-measure conditions. In the special case of bang-bang solutions, we introduce another assumption to obtain the same convergence rates. This new condition turns out to be useful in the derivation of error estimates for the discretized problem. The necessity of the just mentioned assumptions to obtain certain convergence rates is analyzed. Finally, numerical examples confirm the analytical findings.

Keywords: Tikhonov regularization, Optimal control, Control constraints, A-priori error estimates, Bang-bang controls.

1 Introduction

In this article we study the regularization of the minimization problem

$$\min_{u \in U_{\text{ad}}} J_0(u) \quad \text{with} \quad J_0(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|Tu - z\|_H^2 \quad (\mathbb{P}_0)$$

for $T : U \rightarrow H$ a given linear and continuous operator between the control space $U := L^2(\Omega_U)$ with scalar product $(\cdot, \cdot)_U$ and an arbitrary Hilbert space H where $z \in H$ is a fixed function to be approached. The set $\Omega_U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 1$, is a bounded measurable domain and the set of admissible controls $U_{\text{ad}} \subset U$ is given by

$$U_{\text{ad}} := \{u \in U \mid a(x) \leq u(x) \leq b(x) \quad \text{for almost all } x \in \Omega_U\} \quad (1)$$

with fixed control bounds $a, b \in L^\infty(\Omega_U)$.

We give two instances of T as solution operators of linear partial differential equations (PDEs):

*Schwerpunkt Optimierung und Approximation, Universität Hamburg, Bundesstraße 55, 20146 Hamburg, Germany, nvdmath@gmx.net

Example 1. Let y be the unique weak solution of the Poisson problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta y &= u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ y &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

for given $u \in L^2(\Omega)$ on some bounded sufficiently regular domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$, with boundary $\partial\Omega$.

We set $\Omega_U := \Omega$ and get $y = Tu$ where $T : U = L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H := L^2(\Omega)$ is the weak solution operator associated with problem (2).

Example 2. Consider the heat equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t y - \Delta y &= Bu & \text{in } I \times \Omega, \\ y &= 0 & \text{in } I \times \partial\Omega, \\ y(0) &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

with a control operator $B : U \rightarrow L^2(I, H^{-1}(\Omega))$.

We fix a time interval $I := (0, T_e) \subset \mathbb{R}$ with a given end-time fulfilling $0 < T_e < \infty$. Furthermore, we assume Ω to be a domain as in the previous example. Let $T := SB$ be the control-to-state operator with $S : L^2(I, H^{-1}(\Omega)) \rightarrow H := L^2(I, L^2(\Omega))$ being the weak solution operator for the heat equation (3).

Let us mention two instances for the control operator B :

1. (Distributed controls) We set $\Omega_U := I \times \Omega$. The control operator $B : U = H \rightarrow L^2(I, H^{-1}(\Omega))$ is given by $B := \text{Id}$, i.e., the identity mapping induced by the standard Sobolev imbedding $\iota : L^2(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{-1}(\Omega)$.
2. (Located controls) Let $\Omega_U := I$ and $g_1 \in L^2(\Omega)$ be a fixed function. The operator B given by

$$B : L^2(I, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(I, H^{-1}(\Omega)), \quad u \mapsto (t \mapsto u(t)\iota g_1), \tag{4}$$

with ι from the previous item maps a control function u depending only on time to a function distributed in space-time.

With little more effort one can consider the case of several fixed functions $g_1, \dots, g_D$, replacing B by $u \mapsto (t \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^D u_i(t)\iota g_i)$ and seeking for control functions $u_1, \dots, u_D$. We omit this generalization here to shorten the exposition and refer the interested reader to [Dan16].

To unify the examples just given, it is useful to write $T = SB$ with two continuous linear operators $B : U \rightarrow R$ and $S : R \rightarrow H$ where R is an appropriately chosen function space. This decomposition is always possible for a given T by taking $B = \text{Id}$ and $S = T$ (or vice versa).

Often, the solutions of $(\mathbb{P}_0)$ possess a special structure: They take values only on the bounds a and b of the admissible set U_{ad} given in (1) and are therefore called *bang-bang solutions*.

Theoretical and numerical questions related to this control problem attracted much interest in recent years, see, e.g., [DH12], [WW11a], [WW11b], [WW13], [Wac13], [Wac14], [GY11], [Fel03], [Alt+12], [AS11], and [Sey15]. The last four papers are concerned with T being the solution operator of an *ordinary* differential equation, the former paper with T being a solution operator of an *elliptic* PDE as in Example 1 or T being a general linear operator as here. In [Dan16], a brief survey of the content of these and some other related papers is given at the end of the bibliography. For an appropriate discretization of Example 2 we refer to [DHV15], [Dan16], and the forthcoming [DH].

Problem $(\mathbb{P}_0)$ is in general ill-posed, meaning that a solution does not depend continuously on the datum z , see [WW11b, p. 1130]. The numerical treatment of a discretized version of $(\mathbb{P}_0)$ is also challenging, e.g., due to the absence of formula (6) in the case $\alpha = 0$, which corresponds to problem $(\mathbb{P}_0)$.

Therefore, we use Tikhonov regularization to overcome these difficulties. The *regularized problem* is given by

$$\min_{u \in U_{\text{ad}}} J_\alpha(u) \quad \text{with} \quad J_\alpha(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|Tu - z\|_H^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|u\|_U^2 \quad (\mathbb{P}_\alpha)$$

where $\alpha > 0$ denotes the regularization parameter. Note that for $\alpha = 0$, problem $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha)$ reduces to problem $(\mathbb{P}_0)$.

We will show in the next section that this problem has a unique solution $\bar{u}_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$, thus especially in the case of the *limit problem* $(\mathbb{P}_0)$.

The regularization leads at once to the question of convergence of $\bar{u}_\alpha$ to $\bar{u}_0$ if α tends to zero. If convergence is established, the rate of convergence is of interest. Since the limit problem $(\mathbb{P}_0)$ can be interpreted as a linear inverse problem with convex constraints given by U_{ad} , a first result on the convergence rate follows from well-known theorems.

Better results can be obtained if an assumption on the smoothness of the limit problem $(\mathbb{P}_0)$ is fulfilled, a mixture of a source condition, known from the inverse problem literature, and a measure condition, developed for control problems. This source-measure condition was introduced in [WW11b, Assumption 3.1], to derive, among other things, convergence rates for the Tikhonov error. The improvement of these rates culminating in Theorem 11 is the content of the third section.

The necessity of the source-measure condition to obtain better convergence rates is a topic which is discussed in the fourth section. We present a new proof of the necessity of the measure condition which motivates another condition in the special case of bang-bang solutions.

This new condition is exploited in the fifth section. We show that the condition implies the same convergence rates as with the source-measure

condition. The new condition is (almost) necessary to obtain these rates. Finally, it turns out that the new and the old condition coincide if the limit problem is of certain regularity. The reason to introduce this new condition is that it leads to an improved bound on the decay of smoothness in the weak derivative of the optimal control when α tends to zero. This bound is useful to derive improved convergence rates for the discretization errors of the regularized problem, which we sketch.

The last section is concerned with numerical examples confirming our theoretical findings.

2 First results

Lemma 3. *The optimal control problem $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha)$ admits for fixed $\alpha \geq 0$ a unique solution $(\bar{y}_\alpha, \bar{u}_\alpha) \in H \times U$, which can be characterized by the first order necessary and sufficient optimality condition*

$$\bar{u}_\alpha \in U_{\text{ad}}, \quad (\alpha \bar{u}_\alpha + B^* \bar{p}_\alpha, u - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U_{\text{ad}} \quad (5)$$

where B^* denotes the adjoint operator of B , $\bar{y}_\alpha := T\bar{u}_\alpha$ is the optimal state, and $\bar{p}_\alpha$ is the optimal adjoint state defined by $\bar{p}_\alpha := S^*(\bar{y}_\alpha - z)$.

Proof. This follows from standard results, see, e.g., [Hin+09, Theorem 1.46, p. 66] or [Trö05, Satz 2.14]. Note that the theorem remains valid even in the case $\alpha = 0$ since in our setting U_{ad} is bounded and the cost functional is strictly convex. $\square$

As a consequence of the fact that U_{ad} is a closed and convex set in a Hilbert space we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *In the case $\alpha > 0$ the variational inequality (5) is equivalent to*

$$\bar{u}_\alpha = P_{U_{\text{ad}}} \left(-\frac{1}{\alpha} B^* \bar{p}_\alpha \right) \quad (6)$$

where $P_{U_{\text{ad}}} : U \rightarrow U_{\text{ad}}$ is the orthogonal projection.

Proof. See [Hin+09, Corollary 1.2, p. 70] with $\gamma = \frac{1}{\alpha}$. $\square$

We now derive an explicit characterization of the optimal control.

Lemma 5. *If $\alpha > 0$, then for almost all $x \in \Omega_U$ there holds for the optimal control*

$$\bar{u}_\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} a(x) & \text{if } B^* \bar{p}_\alpha(x) + \alpha a(x) > 0, \\ -\alpha^{-1} B^* \bar{p}_\alpha(x) & \text{if } B^* \bar{p}_\alpha(x) + \alpha \bar{u}_\alpha(x) = 0, \\ b(x) & \text{if } B^* \bar{p}_\alpha(x) + \alpha b(x) < 0, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Suppose $\alpha = 0$ is given. Then the optimal control fulfills a.e. in Ω_U

$$\bar{u}_0(x) = \begin{cases} a(x) & \text{if } B^* \bar{p}_0(x) > 0, \\ b(x) & \text{if } B^* \bar{p}_0(x) < 0, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Proof. Let us first note that the variational inequality (5) is for $\alpha \geq 0$ equivalent to the following pointwise one:

$$\forall x \in \Omega_U \ \forall v \in [a(x), b(x)] : (\alpha \bar{u}_\alpha(x) + B^* \bar{p}_\alpha(x), v - \bar{u}_\alpha(x))_{\mathbb{R}} \geq 0 \quad (9)$$

where “ $\forall$ ” denotes “for almost all”.

This can be shown via a Lebesgue point argument, see the proof of [Trö05, Lemma 2.26]. By cases, one immediately derives (7) and (8) from (9). $\square$

As a consequence of (8) we have: If $B^* \bar{p}_0$ vanishes only on a subset of Ω_U with Lebesgue measure zero, the optimal control $\bar{u}_0$ only takes values on the bounds a and b of the admissible set U_{ad} given in (1). In this case $\bar{u}_0$ is called a *bang-bang solution*.

From Lemma 3 we know that a unique solution $\bar{u}_0$ of $(\mathbb{P}_0)$ exists. As a consequence, we get convergence $\bar{u}_\alpha \rightarrow \bar{u}_0$ if $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and even a first convergence rate for the error of the optimal state $\bar{y}_\alpha$, as the following Theorem shows.

Theorem 6. *For the solutions $(\bar{u}_\alpha, \bar{y}_\alpha)$ of $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha)$ and $(\bar{u}_0, \bar{y}_0)$ of $(\mathbb{P}_0)$, there holds*

1. *The optimal control and the optimal state depend continuously on α . More precisely, the inequality*

$$\|\bar{y}_{\alpha'} - \bar{y}_\alpha\|_H^2 + \alpha' \|\bar{u}_{\alpha'} - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_U^2 \leq (\alpha - \alpha')(\bar{u}_\alpha, \bar{u}_{\alpha'} - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U \quad (10)$$

holds for all $\alpha \geq 0$ and all $\alpha' \geq 0$.

2. *The regularized solutions converge to the unregularized one, i.e.,*

$$\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_U \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{if } \alpha \rightarrow 0. \quad (11)$$

3. *The optimal state satisfies the rate of convergence*

$$\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H = o(\sqrt{\alpha}). \quad (12)$$

Proof. The Theorem is a collection of classic results from the theory of linear inverse problems with convex constraints (given here by U_{ad}) taken from [EHN00, Chapter 5.4], see also [Neu86]. We also refer to [Dan16, Theorem 14] for a proof at one place in the above notation. $\square$

3 Refined convergence rates under additional assumptions

From now onwards we assume that the bounds a and b of the admissible set U_{ad} fulfill $a \leq 0 \leq b$ almost everywhere. For $(\mathbb{P}_0)$, the problem we finally

want to solve, this assumption can always be met by a simple transformation of the variables.

To prove better rates of convergence with respect to α , we rely on the following assumption.

Assumption 7. *There exist a set $A \subset \Omega_U$, a function $w \in H$ with $T^*w \in L^\infty(\Omega_U)$ and constants $\kappa > 0$ and $C \geq 0$, such that there holds the inclusion $\{x \in \Omega_U \mid B^*\bar{p}_0(x) = 0\} \subset A^c$ for the complement $A^c = \Omega_U \setminus A$ of A and in addition*

1. (source condition)

$$\chi_{A^c}\bar{u}_0 = \chi_{A^c}P_{U_{\text{ad}}}(T^*w). \quad (13)$$

2. $(\bar{p}_0)$ -measure condition)

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 : \quad \text{meas}(\{x \in A \mid 0 \leq |B^*\bar{p}_0(x)| \leq \epsilon\}) \leq C\epsilon^\kappa \quad (14)$$

with the convention that $\kappa := \infty$ if the left-hand side of (14) is zero for some $\epsilon > 0$.

Source conditions of the form $\bar{u}_0 = P_{U_{\text{ad}}}(T^*w)$ are well known in the theory of inverse problems with convex constraints, see [Neu86] and [EHN00]. However, since they are usually posed almost everywhere, thus globally, they are unlikely to hold in the optimal control setting with T as in, e.g., Example 1, see [WW11a, p. 860].

Similar measure conditions were previously used for control problems with elliptic PDEs, starting with the analysis in [WW11a] and [DH12].

A condition related to the measure condition was also used to establish stability results for bang-bang control problems with autonomous ODEs, see [Fel03, Assumption 2].

In all above-mentioned references, the measure condition (14) is assumed to hold with $A = \Omega_U$, thus globally. Together with formula (8) one immediately observes that this implies bang-bang controls.

The combination of both conditions in Assumption 7 turned out to be very useful in the context of elliptic optimal control problems, see [WW11b; WW13].

Key ingredient in our analysis of the regularization error is the following lemma, which has its origin in the proof of [WW11b, Theorem 3.5].

Lemma 8. *Let Assumption 7.2 hold. For the solution $\bar{u}_0$ of $(\mathbb{P}_0)$, there holds with some constant $C > 0$ independent of α and u*

$$C\|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa} \leq (B^*\bar{p}_0, u - \bar{u}_0)_A \leq (B^*\bar{p}_0, u - \bar{u}_0)_U \quad \forall u \in U_{\text{ad}} \quad (15)$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)_A$ and $(\cdot, \cdot)_U$ denote the scalar products in $L^2(A)$ and $U = L^2(\Omega_U)$, respectively.

Proof. For $\epsilon > 0$ we define $B_\epsilon := \{x \in A \mid |B^* \bar{p}_0| \geq \epsilon\}$. Using the (point-wise) optimality condition (9) and Assumption 7.2, we conclude for some $u \in U_{\text{ad}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_U} (B^* \bar{p}_0, u - \bar{u}_0)_{\mathbb{R}} &= \int_{\Omega_U} |B^* \bar{p}_0| |u - \bar{u}_0| \geq \int_A |B^* \bar{p}_0| |u - \bar{u}_0| \\ &\geq \epsilon \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(B_\epsilon)} \\ &\geq \epsilon \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)} - \epsilon \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A \setminus B_\epsilon)} \\ &\geq \epsilon \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)} - \epsilon \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)} \text{meas}(A \setminus B_\epsilon) \\ &\geq \epsilon \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)} - c \epsilon^{\kappa+1} \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)} \end{aligned}$$

where without loss of generality $c > 1$.

Setting $\epsilon := c^{-2/\kappa} \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1/\kappa} \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)}^{-1/\kappa}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A (B^* \bar{p}_0, u - \bar{u}_0)_{\mathbb{R}} &\geq c^{-2/\kappa} \left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right) \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)}^{-1/\kappa} \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa} \\ &\geq c^{-2/\kappa} \left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right) \|b - a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)}^{-1/\kappa} \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa} \end{aligned}$$

by the definition of U_{ad} . $\square$

With the previous Lemma, we can now improve the inequality (10) (setting there $\alpha := 0$) from general inverse problem theory, since the error in the control in the L^1 norm now appears on the left-hand side with a factor $C > 0$ independent of α . This is in contrast to the error in the L^2 norm.

Lemma 9. *Let Assumption 7.2 hold (with possibly $\text{meas}(A) = 0$). Then there holds for some $C > 0$ independent of α*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H^2 + C \|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa} + \alpha \|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_U^2 \\ \leq \alpha (\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U \quad \forall \alpha > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Adding the necessary condition for $\bar{u}_\alpha$ (5) with $u := \bar{u}_0$, i.e.,

$$0 \leq (\alpha \bar{u}_\alpha + B^* \bar{p}_\alpha, \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U,$$

to the estimate (15) of Lemma 8 with $u := \bar{u}_\alpha$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} C \|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa} &\leq (B^* (\bar{p}_\alpha - \bar{p}_0), \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U + \alpha (\bar{u}_\alpha, \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U \\ &\leq -\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H^2 + \alpha (\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U \\ &\quad + \alpha (\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U \\ &\leq -\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H^2 - \alpha \|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_U^2 + \alpha (\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

The following Lemma is extracted from the proof of [WW11b, Lemma 3.9]. It shows how the source condition (Assumption 7.1) is taken into account to reduce the error estimate to the set A .

Lemma 10. *Let Assumption 7.1 (source condition) be satisfied. Then there holds with a constant $C > 0$*

$$(\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_0 - u)_U \leq C(\|T(u - \bar{u}_0)\|_H + \|u - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}) \quad \forall u \in U_{\text{ad}}.$$

Proof. The source condition is equivalent to

$$0 \leq (\chi_{A^c}(\bar{u}_0 - T^*w), u - \bar{u}_0)_U \quad \forall u \in U_{\text{ad}}.$$

Using this representation, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_0 - u)_U &\leq (\chi_{A^c}T^*w, \bar{u}_0 - u)_U + (\chi_A\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_0 - u)_U \\ &\leq (w, T(\bar{u}_0 - u))_H + (-T^*w + \bar{u}_0, \chi_A(\bar{u}_0 - u))_U. \end{aligned}$$

Since $T^*w \in L^\infty(\Omega_U)$, we get the claim. $\square$

Using this Lemma, we can now state regularization error estimates. We consider different situations with respect to the fulfillment of parts of Assumption 7.

Theorem 11. *For the regularization error there holds with positive constants c and C independent of $\alpha > 0$ the following.*

1. *The error in the optimal state fulfills the rate of convergence*

$$\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H = o(\sqrt{\alpha}).$$

2. *Let Assumption 7.1 be satisfied with $\text{meas}(A) = 0$ (source condition holds a.e. on the domain). Then the optimal control converges with the rate*

$$\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_U \leq C\sqrt{\alpha}, \tag{16}$$

and the optimal state converges with the improved rate

$$\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H \leq C\alpha. \tag{17}$$

3. *Let Assumption 7.2 be satisfied with $\text{meas}(A^c) = 0$ (measure condition holds a.e. on the domain). Then the estimates*

$$\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(\Omega_U)} \leq C\alpha^\kappa \tag{18}$$

$$\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_U \leq C\alpha^{\kappa/2} \tag{19}$$

$$\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H \leq C\alpha^{(\kappa+1)/2} \tag{20}$$

hold true.

If furthermore $\kappa > 1$ holds and in addition

$$T^* : \text{range}(T) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega_U) \quad \text{exists and is continuous,} \quad (21)$$

we can improve (20) to

$$\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H \leq C\alpha^\kappa. \quad (22)$$

4. Let Assumption 7 be satisfied with $\text{meas}(A) \cdot \text{meas}(A^c) > 0$ (source and measure condition on parts of the domain). Then the following estimates

$$\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)} \leq C\alpha^{\min(\kappa, \frac{2}{1+1/\kappa})} \quad (23)$$

$$\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_U \leq C\alpha^{\min(\kappa, 1)/2} \quad (24)$$

$$\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H \leq C\alpha^{\min((\kappa+1)/2, 1)} \quad (25)$$

hold true.

If furthermore $\kappa > 1$ and (21) hold, we have the improved estimate

$$\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)} \leq C\alpha^\kappa. \quad (26)$$

Proof. 1. The estimate is just a repetition of (12).

3. Let us recall the estimates of Lemma 9, i.e.,

$$\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H^2 + C\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa} + \alpha\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_U^2 \leq \alpha(\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U. \quad (27)$$

By Young's inequality we can estimate

$$\alpha\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)} \leq C\alpha^{\kappa+1} + C\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa}. \quad (28)$$

If $A = \Omega_U$ up to a set of measure zero, we can combine both estimates, since $\bar{u}_0 \in U_{\text{ad}} \subset L^\infty$, and move the second summand of the just mentioned estimate to the left. This yields the claim since

$$\frac{\kappa + 1}{1 + 1/\kappa} = \kappa.$$

The improved estimate (22) can be obtained with the help of (18) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H^2 &= (T^*(\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0), \bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0)_U \leq C\|T^*(\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0)\|_{L^\infty}\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq C\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1} \leq C\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H\alpha^\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

2.+4. We combine (27) with the estimate of Lemma 10 (with $u := \bar{u}_\alpha$), invoke Cauchy's inequality and get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H^2 + C\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa} + \alpha\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_U^2 \\ \leq \alpha(\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U \leq C\alpha(\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H + \|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}) \\ \leq C\alpha^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H^2 + C\alpha\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}. \end{aligned}$$

We now move the second addend to the left.

If $\text{meas}(A) = 0$ (case 2.), we are done. Otherwise (case 4.) we continue estimating, making use of (28), to get

$$\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H^2 + C\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa} + \alpha\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_U^2 \leq C\alpha^{\min(2, \kappa+1)},$$

from which the claim follows.

To establish formula (26), we start with the estimate

$$C\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa} \leq (B^*(\bar{p}_\alpha - \bar{p}_0), \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_A + \alpha(\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha)_A$$

which follows along the lines of the proof of Lemma 9. Recall that $(\cdot, \cdot)_A$ denotes the scalar products in $L^2(A)$. Making use of (21) and the convergence rate (25) with $\kappa > 1$, we conclude

$$\|\bar{p}_\alpha - \bar{p}_0\|_{L^\infty(A)} \leq C\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H \leq C\alpha.$$

Combining both estimates gives

$$\begin{aligned} C\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(A)}^{1+1/\kappa} &\leq C(\|\bar{p}_\alpha - \bar{p}_0\|_{L^\infty(A)} + \alpha)\|\bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^1(A)} \\ &\leq C\alpha\|\bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^1(A)}. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing the expression by the norm on the right and taking the κ th power, we are done. $\square$

Some remarks on the previous theorem are in order.

Let us compare the first with the other cases, where Assumption 7 is taken (partially) into account. In all cases, we get an improved convergence rate for the optimal state.

The second case replicates well known estimates from the theory of inverse problems with convex constraints, see, e.g., [Neu86] and [EHN00, Theorem 5.19]. However, as indicated in the discussion after Assumption 7, this situation is unlikely to hold in the context of optimal control problems.

Concerning the “min”-functions in the estimates of case 4, we note that the left argument is chosen if $\kappa < 1$, the right one if $\kappa > 1$. In the case $\kappa = 1$, both expressions coincide. Thus the worse part of Assumption 7 with respect to the rates of cases 2 and 3 dominates the convergence behavior

of the regularization errors in the mixed situation of case 4 on the whole domain Ω_U . This, however, is not the case locally on A , as (26) shows.

As mentioned after Assumption 7, case 3 implies bang-bang controls.

The condition (21) is fulfilled for Example 1 since $T^* : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H^2(\Omega) \cap H^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)$ by well-known regularity theory and Sobolev imbeddings, see, e.g., [Eva98], if Ω is sufficiently regular.

For Example 2, condition (21) is also valid, see [Dan16, p. 24].

Let us finally mention that the cases 3. and 4. improve (with respect to κ and the dependence on condition (21)) several recently obtained convergence results in [WW11b, Theorem 3.2]. Note for comparison, that (21) is always assumed in [WW11b, Theorem 3.2] and p_α there is $B^*\bar{p}_\alpha$ here. If we assume (21), we can estimate $\|B^*(\bar{p}_0 - \bar{p}_\alpha)\|_{L^\infty} = \|T^*(\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_\alpha)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_\alpha\|_H$, and combine this with (20), (22), or (25).

4 Necessity of the additional assumptions

Let us now consider the question of necessity of Assumption 7 to obtain convergence rates, thus a converse of Theorem 11.

We first show that a convergence rate $\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H \leq C\alpha$ implies the source condition (13) to hold at least on $\{x \in \Omega_U \mid B^*\bar{p}_0(x) = 0\}$.

The following Theorem is mainly taken from [WW13, Theorem 4]. It resembles a necessity result known from inverse problem theory, see, e.g., [EHN00, Theorem 5.19] or [Neu86]. However, in inverse problems, the condition $T\bar{u}_0 = z$ is typically assumed.

Theorem 12. *If we assume a convergence rate $\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H = \mathcal{O}(\alpha)$, then there exists a function $w \in H$ such that $\bar{u}_0 = P_{U_{\text{ad}}}(T^*w)$ holds pointwise a.e. on $K := \{x \in \Omega_U \mid B^*\bar{p}_0(x) = 0\}$. Thus (13) holds on K instead of A^c .*

If even $\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H = o(\alpha)$, then $\bar{u}_0$ vanishes on K .

Proof. Let us first define a test function $\hat{u} \in U_{\text{ad}}$ for $x \in \Omega_U$ by

$$\hat{u}(x) \begin{cases} = a(x) & \text{if } B^*\bar{p}_0(x) > 0, \\ \in [a(x), b(x)] & \text{if } B^*\bar{p}_0(x) = 0, \\ = b(x) & \text{if } B^*\bar{p}_0(x) < 0. \end{cases}$$

We consider the necessary condition (5) for $\bar{u}_\alpha$, i.e.,

$$(\alpha\bar{u}_\alpha + B^*\bar{p}_\alpha, u - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U_{\text{ad}},$$

for the special case $u = \hat{u}$ and add the necessary condition for $\bar{u}_0$, evaluated at $u = \bar{u}_\alpha$. We obtain

$$0 \leq (\alpha\bar{u}_\alpha + B^*(\bar{p}_\alpha - \bar{p}_0), \hat{u} - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U + (B^*\bar{p}_0, \hat{u} - \bar{u}_\alpha + \bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0)_U.$$

By construction of $\hat{u}$ and the representation of $\bar{u}_0$ from Lemma 5, we conclude that the second scalar product vanishes. Thus we end up with

$$0 \leq (\alpha \bar{u}_\alpha + T^* T (\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0), \hat{u} - \bar{u}_\alpha)_U,$$

and dividing the expression by α and taking the limit we get with the help of (11) the inequality

$$0 \leq (T^* \dot{y}_0 + \bar{u}_0, \hat{u} - \bar{u}_0)_U$$

for any weak subsequential limit $\dot{y}_0$ of $\frac{1}{\alpha}(\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0)$, which exists due to the assumption of the Theorem. The first assertion is now a direct consequence of the construction of $\hat{u}$.

The second assertion follows from the equality $\dot{y}_0 = 0$ in case of $\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H = o(\alpha)$. $\square$

We next show that if (21) and $\kappa > 1$ hold true, convergence as in Theorem 11.3 implies the measure condition (14).

Theorem 13. *Let us assume $\{x \in \Omega_U \mid B^* \bar{p}_0(x) = 0\} \subset A^c$ for some given set $A \subset \Omega_U$. Let us further assume the σ -condition*

$$\exists \sigma > 0 \forall' x \in \Omega_U : \quad a \leq -\sigma < 0 < \sigma \leq b \quad (29)$$

where “ $\forall'$ ” denotes “for almost all”.

If $\kappa > 1$ and convergence rates $\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^p(A)}^p + \|B^*(\bar{p}_\alpha - \bar{p}_0)\|_{L^\infty(A)} \leq C\alpha^\kappa$ are known to hold for some real $p \geq 1$, then the measure condition (14) from Assumption 7 is fulfilled.

Proof. Let us split the set A into the subsets

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &:= \{x \in A \mid -B^* \bar{p}_0 < 0 \text{ and } \alpha a \geq -B^* \bar{p}_\alpha\}, \\ A_1 &:= \{x \in A \mid -B^* \bar{p}_0 < 0 \text{ and } \alpha a < -B^* \bar{p}_\alpha < \alpha b\}, \\ A_2 &:= \{x \in A \mid -B^* \bar{p}_0 < 0 < \alpha b \leq -B^* \bar{p}_\alpha\}, \\ A_3 &:= \{x \in A \mid -B^* \bar{p}_0 > 0 \text{ and } \alpha a < -B^* \bar{p}_\alpha < \alpha b\}, \\ A_4 &:= \{x \in A \mid -B^* \bar{p}_0 > 0 > \alpha a \geq -B^* \bar{p}_\alpha\}, \quad \text{and} \\ A_5 &:= \{x \in A \mid -B^* \bar{p}_0 > 0 \text{ and } \alpha b \leq -B^* \bar{p}_\alpha\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $A = A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3 \cup A_4 \cup A_5$, and from Lemma 5 we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A |\bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha|^p &= \int_{A_1} |a + \alpha^{-1} B^* \bar{p}_\alpha|^p + \int_{A_3} |b + \alpha^{-1} B^* \bar{p}_\alpha|^p + \int_{A_2 \cup A_4} |a - b|^p \\ &\geq \int_{A_1} |a + \alpha^{-1} B^* \bar{p}_\alpha|^p + \int_{A_3} |b + \alpha^{-1} B^* \bar{p}_\alpha|^p \\ &\geq \left(\frac{\sigma}{2}\right)^p \text{meas}\left(\left\{x \in A \mid |B^* \bar{p}_\alpha| \leq \frac{\sigma}{2} \alpha\right\}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Thus from $\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^p(A)}^p \leq C\alpha^\kappa$ and (30) we conclude

$$\text{meas}(\{x \in A \mid |B^*\bar{p}_\alpha| \leq C_1\alpha\}) \leq C_2\alpha^\kappa.$$

Since $\kappa > 1$ and $\|B^*(\bar{p}_\alpha - \bar{p}_0)\|_{L^\infty(A)} \leq C\alpha^\kappa$, we get for some arbitrarily chosen $x \in A$ with $|B^*\bar{p}_0(x)| \leq \alpha C_1/2$ the estimate

$$|B^*\bar{p}_\alpha(x)| \leq |B^*\bar{p}_0(x)| + |B^*(\bar{p}_\alpha - \bar{p}_0)(x)| \leq \frac{C_1}{2}(\alpha + \alpha^{\kappa-\epsilon}) \leq C_1\alpha$$

for some sufficiently small $\epsilon = \epsilon(C_1, \kappa) > 0$. Consequently, we have

$$\text{meas}\left(\left\{x \in A \mid |B^*\bar{p}_\alpha| \leq \frac{C_1}{2}\alpha\right\}\right) \leq C_2\alpha^\kappa.$$

□

Concerning the previous Theorem, let us mention the related result [WW13, Theorem 8]. It has the same implication, but assumes (19) and (20), which imply the prerequisites of Theorem 13 in case of (21).

For the case $\kappa \leq 1$, it is an open question whether the previous Theorem (and likewise [WW13, Theorem 8]) is valid.

5 Bang-bang solutions

In this section, we consider bang-bang solutions, i.e.,

$$\text{meas}(\{x \in \Omega_U \mid B^*\bar{p}_0(x) = 0\}) = 0. \quad (31)$$

We introduce at first a second measure condition and show that it implies the same convergence results as in Theorem 11.3, thus can replace the $\bar{p}_0$ -measure condition (14) from Assumption 7.

Definition 14 ($\bar{p}_\alpha$ -measure condition). *If for the set*

$$I_\alpha := \{x \in \Omega_U \mid \alpha a < -B^*\bar{p}_\alpha < \alpha b\} \quad (32)$$

the condition

$$\exists \bar{\alpha} > 0 \forall 0 < \alpha < \bar{\alpha} : \quad \text{meas}(I_\alpha) \leq C\alpha^\kappa \quad (33)$$

holds true (with the convention that $\kappa := \infty$ if the measure in (33) is zero for all $0 < \alpha < \bar{\alpha}$), we say that the $\bar{p}_\alpha$ -measure condition is fulfilled.

The equality in the estimate (30) from the proof of Theorem 13 shows that if the $\bar{p}_\alpha$ -measure condition holds and we assume the additional condition $\text{meas}(A_2 \cup A_4) \leq C\alpha^\kappa$ (with A_i as in that proof), we get the convergence rate $\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^p(\Omega_U, \mathbb{R}^D)}^p \leq C\alpha^\kappa$ for each $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Interestingly, this additional condition is not needed to obtain convergence in the control, as we will now show.

Theorem 15. *If the $\bar{p}_\alpha$ -measure condition (33) and the σ -condition (29) are fulfilled, the convergence rates*

$$\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^1(\Omega_U)} \leq C\alpha^\kappa \quad \text{and} \quad \|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H \leq C\alpha^{(\kappa+1)/2} \quad (34)$$

hold true.

If in addition $\kappa > 1$ and (21) is fulfilled, we have the improved estimate

$$\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_H \leq C\alpha^\kappa. \quad (35)$$

Proof. Let $u \in U_{\text{ad}}$ be arbitrarily chosen. For the active set I_α^c of $\bar{p}_\alpha$, which is the complement of the inactive set I_α defined in (32), we have by Lemma 5, making use of the σ -condition (29), the estimate

$$(B^*\bar{p}_\alpha, u - \bar{u}_\alpha)_{I_\alpha^c} = \int_{I_\alpha^c} |B^*\bar{p}_\alpha| |u - \bar{u}_\alpha| \geq \sigma\alpha \|u - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^1(I_\alpha^c)}. \quad (36)$$

Invoking the $\bar{p}_\alpha$ -measure condition (33), we get on the inactive set itself the estimate

$$|(B^*\bar{p}_\alpha, u - \bar{u}_\alpha)_{I_\alpha}| \leq C\alpha \|u - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^1(I_\alpha)} \leq CC_{ab}\alpha^{\kappa+1} \quad (37)$$

with $C_{ab} = \max(\|a\|_\infty, \|b\|_\infty)$. Consequently, with $L^1 := L^1(\Omega_U)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma\alpha \|u - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^1} - C\alpha^{\kappa+1} &\stackrel{(33)}{\leq} \sigma\alpha \|u - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^1} - \sigma\alpha \|u - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^1(I_\alpha)} \\ &= \sigma\alpha \|u - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^1(I_\alpha^c)} \\ &\stackrel{(36)}{\leq} (B^*\bar{p}_\alpha, u - \bar{u}_\alpha)_{I_\alpha^c} \\ &= (B^*\bar{p}_\alpha, u - \bar{u}_\alpha) - (B^*\bar{p}_\alpha, u - \bar{u}_\alpha)_{I_\alpha} \\ &\stackrel{(37)}{\leq} (B^*\bar{p}_\alpha, u - \bar{u}_\alpha) + C\alpha^{\kappa+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Rearranging terms, we conclude

$$\sigma\alpha \|u - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^1} \leq (B^*\bar{p}_\alpha, u - \bar{u}_\alpha) + C\alpha^{\kappa+1}. \quad (39)$$

Taking $u := \bar{u}_0$ in the previous equation and adding the necessary condition (5) for $\bar{u}_0$ for the special case $u := \bar{u}_\alpha$, i.e.,

$$(-B^*\bar{p}_0, \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha) \geq 0, \quad (40)$$

we get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma\alpha \|\bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^1} &\leq (B^*(\bar{p}_\alpha - \bar{p}_0), \bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_\alpha) + C\alpha^{\kappa+1} \\ &= -\|\bar{y}_\alpha - \bar{y}_0\|_I^2 + C\alpha^{\kappa+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

from which the claim follows.

The improved estimate can be established as in the proof of Theorem 11. $\square$

The $\bar{p}_\alpha$ -measure condition (33) is slightly stronger than what actually is necessary in order to obtain the above convergence rates in the control.

Corollary 16. *Let us assume that the σ -condition (29) is valid.*

If the convergence rate $\|\bar{u}_\alpha - \bar{u}_0\|_{L^p(\Omega_U, \mathbb{R}^D)}^p \leq C\alpha^\kappa$ is known to hold for some real $p \geq 1$ and some real $\kappa > 0$, then the measure condition

$$\text{meas}(\{x \in \Omega_U \mid \alpha(a + \epsilon) \leq -B^*\bar{p}_\alpha(x) \leq \alpha(b - \epsilon)\}) \leq \frac{C}{\epsilon^p} \alpha^\kappa \quad (42)$$

is fulfilled for each $0 < \epsilon < \sigma$.

Proof. This follows from the proof of Theorem 13. $\square$

If the limit problem is of certain regularity, the $\bar{p}_\alpha$ -measure condition is not stronger than the $\bar{p}_0$ -measure condition, and, as we show afterwards, both conditions coincide.

Lemma 17. *Let Assumption 7 hold with $\text{meas}(A^c) = 0$ ($\bar{p}_0$ -measure condition is valid a.e. on Ω_U). Let furthermore $\kappa \geq 1$ and (21) be valid. Then the $\bar{p}_\alpha$ -measure condition (33) is fulfilled.*

Proof. Since the set I_α from (32) fulfills $I_\alpha \subset \{x \in \Omega_U \mid |B^*\bar{p}_\alpha| \leq C\alpha\}$ with $C = \max(\|a\|_\infty, \|b\|_\infty)$, we conclude with (21) and Theorem 11 that if $x \in I_\alpha$ and $\kappa \geq 1$, we have

$$|B^*\bar{p}_0| \leq |B^*\bar{p}_\alpha| + |B^*(\bar{p}_0 - \bar{p}_\alpha)| \leq C\alpha.$$

With the $\bar{p}_0$ -measure condition (14) we obtain the estimate

$$\text{meas}(I_\alpha) \leq \text{meas}(\{x \in \Omega_U \mid |B^*\bar{p}_0| \leq C\alpha\}) \leq C\alpha^\kappa,$$

which concludes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 18. *Let a bang-bang solution be given, i.e., (31) holds true. In the case of $\kappa > 1$, (21), and the σ -condition (29), both measure conditions are equivalent.*

Proof. One direction of the claim, namely “ $\bar{p}_0$ -m.c. $\Rightarrow$ $\bar{p}_\alpha$ -m.c.”, has already been shown in Lemma 17.

For the other direction, we know from Theorem 15 that the convergence rates (34) and (35) hold, which by (21) and Theorem 13 imply the $\bar{p}_0$ -measure condition. $\square$

Let us now consider the situation that the optimal adjoint state fulfills the regularity

$$\exists C > 0 : \|\partial_x B^*\bar{p}_\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)} \leq C \quad (43)$$

with a constant $C > 0$ independent of α and ∂_x denoting the weak differential operator.

This bound is valid, e.g., for Example 2.2 (located controls), see [Dan16, p. 30] for a proof.

Furthermore, we assume the Sobolev regularity $a, b \in H^1(\Omega_U)$ for the control bounds.

With this assumptions, the projection formula (6) and the stability of the projection (see [Dan16, Lemma 11]) we obtain with the constant

$$C_{ab} := \|\partial_x a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)} + \|\partial_x b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)} \quad (44)$$

a bound on the derivative of the optimal control, namely

$$\|\partial_x \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \|\partial_x B^* \bar{p}_\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)} + C_{ab} \stackrel{(43)}{\leq} C \frac{1}{\alpha}, \quad (45)$$

if $\alpha > 0$ is sufficiently small.

If the $\bar{p}_\alpha$ -measure condition (33) is valid, this decay of smoothness in dependence of α can be relaxed in weaker norms, as the following Lemma shows.

Lemma 19 (Smoothness decay in the derivative). *Let the $\bar{p}_\alpha$ -measure condition (33) be fulfilled and the regularity condition (43) be valid as well as $a, b \in H^1(\Omega_U)$. Then there holds with the constant C_{ab} defined in (44) for sufficiently small $\alpha > 0$ and each p with $1 \leq p < \infty$ the inequality*

$$\|\partial_x \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^p(\Omega_U)} \leq C \max(C_{ab}, \alpha^{\kappa/p-1}) \quad (46)$$

with a constant $C > 0$ independent of α .

Note that $C_{ab} = 0$ in the case of constant control bounds a and b .

Proof. We invoke (33) and (45) to get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^p(\Omega_U)}^p &\leq \text{meas}(I_\alpha) \|\partial_x \bar{u}_\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_U)}^p + \text{meas}(\Omega_U) C_{ab}^p \\ &\leq C \max(\alpha^{\kappa-p}, C_{ab}^p) \end{aligned}$$

with the set I_α from (32). □

Let us now briefly sketch an application of the previous lemma in the numerical analysis of a suitable finite element discretization of Example 2.2 (located controls), which has been analyzed in detail recently in [Dan16], see also [DH], founded on a novel discretization scheme proposed in [DHV15].

Discretizing the regularized problem $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha)$ in space and time, one ends up with a problem $(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha, kh})$ depending on the regularization parameter $\alpha > 0$ and the grid sizes k and h for the time and space grid, respectively, related to the finite element discretization. This problem is amenable to be solved

on a computer. One can show that this problem has again a unique solution $\bar{u}_{\alpha,kh}$ and that the error fulfills

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_{\alpha,kh}\|_U^2 + \|\bar{u}_0 - \bar{u}_{\alpha,kh}\|_{L^1(\Omega_U)} \\ \leq C \left(\alpha + h^2 + k^2 \max(1, C_{ab}, \alpha^{\kappa/2-1}) \right)^\kappa \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

with $C > 0$ independent of α , k , and h , see [Dan16, Theorem 77].

Here, Lemma 19 is used in the proof to get the factor $\alpha^{\kappa/2-1}$. This factor is obviously better (if $\alpha \rightarrow 0$) than α^{-1} which one would get using estimate (45) only.

Using Lemma 19 one can also show error estimates for other quantities, e.g., an adjoint state error.

6 Numerical examples

We now want to validate numerically the new convergence rates for the regularization error given in Theorem 11.3.

Here, we report only on the errors in the optimal control since we observed no or only poor convergence in the error of the optimal state and adjoint state, respectively. This might be due to the fact that the influence of the space- and time-discretization error is much larger than that of the regularization error. This phenomenon was also observed for elliptic problems, compare [WW11a].

We solve numerically the regularized discretized problem $(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha,kh})$ sketched at the end of the previous section as an approximation of the limit problem $(\mathbb{P}_0)$ in the situation of Example 2.2 (located controls).

We investigate the behavior of the error if $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ for fixed small discretization parameters k and h and different values of the parameter κ from the measure condition (14).

We make use of the fact that instead of the linear control operator B , given by (4), we can also use an *affine linear* control operator

$$\tilde{B} : U \rightarrow L^2(I, H^{-1}(\Omega)), \quad u \mapsto g_0 + Bu \quad (48)$$

where g_0 is a fixed function of certain regularity since g_0 can be interpreted as a modification of z .

We also modify the heat equation (3) in that we take into account a fixed initial value $y(0) = y_0$, which again can be interpreted as a modification of z . We therefor write with a fixed function y_d

$$z = y_d - S(0, y_0) \quad (49)$$

where $S(0, y_0)$ denotes the solution of the heat equation (3) with void right-hand side but initial value y_0 .

We consider a given exact solution of the limit problem $(\mathbb{P}_0)$ which we denote by $(\bar{u}, \bar{y}, \bar{p})$.

With a space-time domain $\Omega \times I := (0, 1)^2 \times (0, 0.5)$, thus $T_e = 0.5$, we choose the optimal control to be the lower bound of the admissible set, i.e., $\bar{u} := a_1 := -0.2$. For the upper bound we set $b_1 := 0.2$.

With the function

$$g_1(x_1, x_2) := \sin(\pi x_1) \sin(\pi x_2)$$

the optimal adjoint state is chosen as

$$\bar{p}(t, x_1, x_2) := (T_e - t)^{1/\kappa} g_1(x_1, x_2)$$

for some fixed $\kappa > 0$ specified below.

With the constant $a := 2$, we take for the optimal state

$$\bar{y}(t, x_1, x_2) := \cos\left(\frac{t}{T_e} 2\pi a\right) \cdot g_1(x_1, x_2),$$

from which we derive

$$-\partial_t \bar{p} - \Delta \bar{p} = \frac{1}{\kappa} (T_e - t)^{1/\kappa-1} g_1 - (T_e - t)^{1/\kappa} \Delta g_1 = \bar{y} - y_d,$$

which gives y_d .

We also get the initial value of the optimal state $\bar{y}$:

$$y_0(x_1, x_2) = \bar{y}(0, x_1, x_2) = g_1(x_1, x_2).$$

Finally we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g_0 &= \partial_t \bar{y} - \Delta \bar{y} - B\bar{u} \\ &= g_1 2\pi \left(-\frac{a}{T_e} \sin\left(\frac{t}{T_e} 2\pi a\right) + \pi \cos\left(\frac{t}{T_e} 2\pi a\right) \right) - g_1 \cdot \bar{u}. \end{aligned}$$

This example fulfills the measure condition (14) of Assumption 7 with $\text{meas}(A^c) = 0$ and exponent κ from the definition of $\bar{p}$.

We solve $(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha, kh})$ numerically with the above data using a fixed-point iteration on the equation

$$\bar{u}_{kh} = P_{U_{\text{ad}}} \left(-\frac{1}{\alpha} B^* \bar{p}_{kh} \right) \quad (50)$$

where $(\bar{u}_{kh}, \bar{y}_{kh}, \bar{p}_{kh})$ denotes the solution triple of problem $(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha, kh})$.

This equation is the discrete analogue of (6).

Each fixed-point iteration is initialized with the starting value $u_{kh}^{(0)} := a_1$ which is the lower bound of the admissible set. As a stopping criterion for

the fixed-point iteration, we require for the discrete adjoint states belonging to the current and the last iterate that

$$\|B^* \left(p_{kh}^{(i)} - p_{kh}^{(i-1)} \right)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times I)} < t_0$$

where $t_0 := 10^{-5}$ is a prescribed threshold.

We end up with what we denote by u_{kh} in the tables below: An approximation of the optimal solution $\bar{u}_{kh}$ of $(\mathbb{P}_{\alpha, kh})$, which itself is the discretized regularized approximation of $\bar{u}$, the solution of the limit problem $(\mathbb{P}_0)$.

We consider a fixed fine space-time mesh with $Nh = (2^5 + 1)^2$ nodes in space and $Nk = (2^{11} + 1)$ nodes in time. The regularization parameter $\alpha = 2^{-\ell}$ is considered for $\ell = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$.

The problem is solved for different values of κ , namely $\kappa = 0.3, 0.5, 1$, and 2 .

Let us remark that the convergence of the fixed-point iteration does not depend on the starting value.

As one can see from the *experimental order of convergence* (EOC) in the Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4, the new convergence rates of Theorem 11.3, more precisely (18) and (19), can be observed numerically. It seems that they cannot be improved any further. In Figure 1, the convergence of the computed optimal control to the limit control is depicted if $\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

ℓ	$\ \bar{u} - u_{kh}\ _{L^1(I, \mathbb{R})}$	$\ \bar{u} - u_{kh}\ _{L^2(I, \mathbb{R})}$	EOC L^1	EOC L^2
1	0.09417668	0.13354708	/	/
2	0.08837777	0.12648809	0.09	0.08
3	0.07681662	0.11533688	0.20	0.13
4	0.06212895	0.10353644	0.31	0.16
5	0.05008158	0.09264117	0.31	0.16
6	0.04011694	0.08237596	0.32	0.17

Table 1: Errors and EOC in the control ($\kappa = 0.3$, $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, h, k fixed).

References

- [Alt+12] Walter Alt et al. “Error bounds for Euler approximation of linear-quadratic control problems with bang-bang solutions”. In: *NACO* 2.3 (2012), pp. 547–570.
- [AS11] Walter Alt and Martin Seydenschwanz. “Regularization and discretization of linear-quadratic control problems”. In: *Control Cybern.* 40.4 (2011), pp. 903–920.

ℓ	$\ \bar{u} - u_{kh}\ $ $L^1(I, \mathbb{R})$	$\ \bar{u} - u_{kh}\ $ $L^2(I, \mathbb{R})$	EOC L^1	EOC L^2
1	0.07912861	0.11494852	/	/
2	0.05957289	0.09753159	0.41	0.24
3	0.04204449	0.08187630	0.50	0.25
4	0.02963509	0.06865675	0.50	0.25
5	0.02084162	0.05749818	0.51	0.26
6	0.01463170	0.04811089	0.51	0.26

Table 2: Errors and EOC in the control ($\kappa = 0.5$, $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, h, k fixed).

ℓ	$\ \bar{u} - u_{kh}\ $ $L^1(I, \mathbb{R})$	$\ \bar{u} - u_{kh}\ $ $L^2(I, \mathbb{R})$	EOC L^1	EOC L^2
1	0.04006495	0.07304858	/	/
2	0.02000722	0.05160925	1.00	0.50
3	0.00998774	0.03646496	1.00	0.50
4	0.00498724	0.02576440	1.00	0.50
5	0.00249053	0.01820019	1.00	0.50
6	0.00123906	0.01282180	1.01	0.51

Table 3: Errors and EOC in the control ($\kappa = 1$, $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, h, k fixed).

- [Dan16] Nikolaus von Daniels. “Bang-bang control of parabolic equations”. Dissertation. Univ. Hamburg, 2016. URL: <http://ediss.sub.uni-hamburg.de/volltexte/2017/8427/>.
- [DH] Nikolaus von Daniels and Michael Hinze. “Variational discretization of a control-constrained parabolic bang-bang optimal control problem”. In: (). Working title, in preparation.
- [DH12] Klaus Deckelnick and Michael Hinze. “A note on the approximation of elliptic control problems with bang-bang controls”. In: *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 51 (2012), pp. 931–939.
- [DHV15] Nikolaus von Daniels, Michael Hinze, and Morten Vierling. “Crank–Nicolson time stepping and variational discretization of control-constrained parabolic optimal control problems”. In: *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 53.3 (2015), pp. 1182–1198.
- [EHN00] Heinz W. Engl, Martin Hanke, and Andreas Neubauer. *Regularization of Inverse Problems*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.
- [Eva98] Lawrence C. Evans. *Partial Differential Equations*. AMS, 1998.




Figure 1: Optimal control $\bar{u}$ (solid) and computed counterpart u_{kh} (dashed) over time after level ℓ ($\kappa = 1$, $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, h, k fixed).

ℓ	$\ \bar{u} - u_{kh}\ _{L^1(I, \mathbb{R})}$	$\ \bar{u} - u_{kh}\ _{L^2(I, \mathbb{R})}$	EOC L^1	EOC L^2
1	0.01081546	0.03305084	/	/
2	0.00279478	0.01690248	1.95	0.97
3	0.00074507	0.00878066	1.91	0.94
4	0.00020543	0.00463711	1.86	0.92
5	0.00005823	0.00246523	1.82	0.91
6	0.00001564	0.00125068	1.90	0.98

Table 4: Errors and EOC in the control ($\kappa = 2$, $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, h, k fixed).

- [Fel03] Ursula Felgenhauer. “On Stability of Bang–Bang Type Controls”. In: *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 41.6 (2003), pp. 1843–1867. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0363012901399271>.
- [GY11] Wei Gong and Ningning Yan. “Robust error estimates for the finite element approximation of elliptic optimal control problems”. In: *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 236.6 (2011), pp. 1370–1381. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2011.09.001>.
- [Hin+09] Michael Hinze et al. *Optimization with PDE Constraints*. Springer, 2009.
- [Neu86] Andreas Neubauer. “Tikhonov-Regularization of Ill-Posed Linear Operator Equations on Closed Convex Sets”. Dissertation. Johannes Kepler-Universität Linz, 1986.
- [Sey15] Martin Seydenschwanz. “Convergence results for the discrete regularization of linear-quadratic control problems with bang–bang solutions”. In: *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 61.3 (2015), pp. 731–760. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10589-015-9730-z>.
- [Trö05] Fredi Tröltzsch. *Optimale Steuerung mit Partiellen Differentialgleichungen*. Vieweg, 2005.

- [Wac13] Daniel Wachsmuth. “Adaptive regularization and discretization of bang-bang optimal control problems”. In: *ETNA 40* (2013), pp. 249–267.
- [Wac14] Daniel Wachsmuth. “Robust error estimates for regularization and discretization of bang-bang control problems”. In: *Comp. Opt. Appl.* 62 (2014), pp. 271–289.
- [WW11a] Daniel Wachsmuth and Gerd Wachsmuth. “Convergence and regularization results for optimal control problems with sparsity functional”. In: *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 17(3) (2011), pp. 858–886.
- [WW11b] Daniel Wachsmuth and Gerd Wachsmuth. “Regularization error estimates and discrepancy principle for optimal control problems with inequality constraints”. In: *Control and Cybernetics*, 40(4) (2011), pp. 1125–1158.
- [WW13] Daniel Wachsmuth and Gerd Wachsmuth. “Necessary conditions for convergence rates of regularizations of optimal control problems”. In: *System Modelling and Optimization*, Springer (2013), pp. 145–154.